Teaching lab the Compass way: Engaging students in authentic research practices and guided self-reflection

Punit R. Gandhi,[1,*] Jesse A. Livezey,[1] Anna M. Zaniewski,[2] Daniel L. Reinholz,[3] and Dimitri R. Dounas-Frazer[4]

[1] *Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*
[2] *Department of Physics, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA*
[3] *Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*
[4] *Center for Excellence in STEM Education, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93407, USA*

Aligning science instruction with authentic scientific practices is a national priority in education. In particular, undergraduate laboratory courses have been criticized as employing recipe-style activities with little emphasis on inquiry and design. This paper offers an alternative laboratory-style course, offered via the Compass Project at UC Berkeley. Using a model-based approach, undergraduate physics students engaged in authentic research practices by iteratively refining their experimental and theoretical designs. The course also promoted lifelong learning skills, such as persistence and organization, through a cycle of student self-reflection and personalized instructor feedback. This cycle is a strategy for providing students with sociocultural support, which is particularly important for students from underrepresented groups in the sciences. We document growth in students' understanding of scientific measurement and, drawing on student reflections, we suggest areas for future research focused on improving students' lifelong learning skills.

arXiv:1404.6831v3 [physics.ed-ph] 11 Mar 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

Physicists conduct experiments through iterative cycles of design, testing, and refinement, yet undergraduate physics students rarely have opportunities to do the same [1].While laboratory (lab) courses can provide opportunities for authentic practice, they often employ uninspiring recipe-style activities with little emphasis on designing, building, or troubleshooting experimental approaches [2]. This has prompted numerous calls to reform physics lab experiences [3, 4], with some arguing authentic inquiry should begin as early as students' freshman year [5, 6] to improve student persistence in physical science majors [4]. Moreover, there is growing recognition that physics education must focus on self-learning, critical thinking, collaboration and other such skills to help students succeed [7].

This paper describes a transformed lab course called *Intro to Measurement*, the third and final course in the Berkeley Compass Project's three-part sequence for first-year undergraduate students [8]. The course borrows elements from other transformed lab courses known to be effective [9–14] and enhances them with attention to the sociocultural aspects of learning physics [15]. *Intro to Measurement* is grounded in the Compass value of supporting students holistically [8], which means working with students on inter- and intra-personal challenges that may affect their academic success in addition to teaching them science concepts and practices. This is accomplished by developing a strong student learning community through a summer bridge program (e.g., Ref. [16]) and strengthening that community through collaborative, project-based coursework during the academic year. By fostering close communities within cohorts of students, Compass seeks to provide a network of support that empowers undergraduate students, particularly those from underrepresented backgrounds [7], to complete physical sciences degrees. As the final freshman-level Compass course, *Intro to Measurement* is intended to help first-year undergraduates develop the skills necessary to be successful as lifelong science learners through guided self-reflection, personalized instructor feedback, and authentic research practices.

The cycle of student self-reflection and instructor feedback described herein is a strategy for providing students with sociocultural support, which is particularly important for students from underrepresented groups in the sciences. This type of support can take many forms, including: buffering critical feedback by highlighting high expectations and assuring students of their capacity to succeed [17]; responding to struggling students by presenting them with strategies for improvement [18]; increasing students confidence and enhancing their self-efficacy [15]; and generally promoting in students a *growth mindset*, *i.e.*, the belief that intelligence is malleable and can be changed with effort [19]. In addition, fostering supportive student/instructor relationships addresses some of the major factors contributing to student attrition in the sciences, namely, the perception of faculty as unapproachable and the rejection of faculty and teaching assistants as role models [20].

The major connection between the laboratory and reflection activities lies not in anticipated outcomes for students, but in the framing of the activities themselves: in the former context, students are working to improve an experimental apparatus or procedure; in the latter, they are working to improve themselves as learners. Our goal is not to make quantitative connections between the outcomes of these two activities, but instead to document the Compass approach to blending lab instruction with holistic student support. We report on a study of 80% of the 10 students who completed a recent iteration of

* punit_gandhi@berkeley.edu

TABLE I. Demographic breakdown of participants ($N = 8$).

Demographic Group	Number
Students with documented disabilities	3
Women	2
Underrepresented racial and ethnic minorities	1
First-generation college students	1
Gender or sexual minorities	1
Abstained from reporting demographic information	2

Intro to Measurement. The present work has three goals: to document the design of a laboratory course based on Compass' holistic learning principles, to understand the course's impact on students' measurement concepts, and to describe students' reflections and corresponding instructor feedback as related to development of lifelong learning skills.

II. COURSE GOALS AND STRUCTURE

Intro to Measurement met for two hours once weekly for a 14-week semester with 10 students and two graduate student co-instructors. Consistent with the diversity-oriented mission of Compass [8], the students were from diverse backgrounds (Table I). The course was designed for the students to spend an additional three hours per week on average outside of class completing individual and group assignments, data analysis, participating in online discussions, completing weekly self-reflections, and working on final projects. The three main learning objectives of the course were for students to: (1) understand the relationship between theoretical models and experimental measurements, (2) become fluent with data analysis techniques, including uncertainty estimation and error propagation, and (3) develop lifelong learning skills. Following the Compass tradition [8], the pedagogical approach employed in *Intro to Measurement* was influenced by *Complex Instruction* [21], a set strategies to promote equity in heterogeneous classrooms, and *Modeling Instruction* [11, 22], a model-centric approach to teaching and learning physics.

Throughout the course, an emphasis was placed on quantifying uncertainty as a means to help students learn to iteratively improve the experimental apparatus, data-taking procedure, and theoretical models. Classroom activities centered around collaborative group work, with students constructing, testing, and refining theoretical models. In the process, students used multiple representations of the relevant physics, including geometric, algebraic, and graphical representations [11]. Activities were designed to have multiple access points in order to support students from diverse backgrounds (Table I) and varying levels of academic preparation (*e.g.*, the exploration activities described in Subsection II A below) . The course culminated in the production of a public artifact describing students' research projects (c.f., Ref. [23]). In lieu of traditional exams, we gauged students' understanding through self-reflections and participation in final research projects.

Instructors facilitated peer-interactions, guiding student learning by asking questions, seeding ideas, encouraging all students to participate, and providing mini-lessons when groups reached an impasse they could not resolve [21, 22]. The *Think-Pair-Share* technique [24] allowed students to think about problems individually before tackling them with their peers. To help students manage their own groupwork, students took on specific roles: mediator, planner, recorder, and timekeeper [21]. Groups then used small whiteboards to document their ideas and share them with the rest of the class [22]. These activities were designed to foster a supportive learning community; students formed bonds by working together on challenging, open-ended problems and by sharing their personal struggles and accomplishments with each other [8].

In addition, students completed weekly reflection assignments that, along with instructor feedback [25], provided the students with opportunity and the necessary guidance to develop lifelong learning skills (c.f., Ref. [26]). These reflections, along with class discussions about measurements of growth as a learner, were aimed at helping the students adopt a growth mindset [19]. Furthermore, the supportive, trusting relationships that formed between students and instructors through this kind of activity have been shown to promote student persistence in physical science majors [15, 20].

The three main components of the course (Fig. 1) are detailed in this section: (1) an eight-week thermal expansion experiment [27], (2) a seven-week independent research project, and (3) weekly self-reflection assignments. We provide details about student outcomes, including students' iterative refinements, in Section III.

A. Thermal expansion experiment

The main goal of the thermal expansion experiment was for students to develop a sophisticated understanding of the relationship between assumptions in a theoretical model and the uncertainties in experimental data. Throughout this process, "systematic errors" and "measurement uncertainty" were treated as arising due to incomplete system models and the relationship between model and measurement was presented as a paradigm for improvement by iteration. To facilitate such an understanding, students used a conceptually and technically simple thermal expansion apparatus to measure the expansion coefficient of a metal wire [27].

The apparatus consisted of a taut horizontal wire from which a hanging weight was suspended (Fig. 2). The wire expanded when heated, causing the hanging weight to drop lower to the ground. By measuring the temperature of the wire and change in height of the mass, students could determine the wire's coefficient of thermal



FIG. 1. Timeline of activities broken into the three major course components: thermal expansion experiment, independent research projects, and holistic student support.



FIG. 2. Thermal expansion apparatus. The ends of a wire are attached to blocks of wood via small metal hooks. Both blocks are fastened to a level, rigid surface (not shown) via c-clamps. Insulated copper wires are attached to the hooks to facilitate electrical connections to an ac power supply. Temperature is controlled by varying the current in the wire. See Ref. [27] for more details.

expansion.

The students engaged in several complementary activities during this first phase of the course: exploration of the apparatus and related concepts; development, testing, and refinement of scientific models and experimental procedures; discussions about the nature of research; and inquiry-based data analysis tutorials. During the initial exploration activities, students rotated through five hands-on research stations; three focused on thermal expansion and two on geometry and forces in hanging wires and chains. These investigations provided shared experiences students could draw upon to be successful later in the course, reducing disparities in prior knowledge. For example, students observed the catenary shape of a loose horizontally stretched chain and how attaching a hanging weight to the center can pull it into a triangle if heavy enough. This provided a foothold for thinking about the effect of the mass of the wire in the experiment and when it can be neglected.

The first iteration of the experiment was an exploration of the apparatus. During this phase, students designed an experimental procedure, collected data, and developed a simple theoretical model to analyze their data. This process provided context for introducing the ideas and methods of uncertainty analysis and error propagation, including how to automate the calculations on a computer using spreadsheet software. Beginning with a model of the experiment that treats the wire as massless and perfectly stiff, students used their data and measurement uncertainties to inform refinements to the model and experimental procedure. In particular, they use inconsistencies between their experimental results and predictions from the initial model to gain information about which effects initially neglected may actually be important (*e.g.*, the mass and elasticity of the wire [27]). They also received hints about which assumptions of the model to question by making anecdotal observation during data collection, such as realizing that the wire may not be completely stiff because it dropped when the hanging weight was added even though they had not yet changed the temperature.

The second iteration of the experiment focused on characterizing effects not included in original model. The students found that they must use a heavy enough hanging weight for the mass of the wire to be negligible but that the heavier hanging weight causes the wire to stretch more. These results informed students' third and final iteration of the experiment: they decided to incorporate elastic stretching into their model of the wire, and chose to repeat the experiment using a weight heavy enough

FIG. 3. Experimental setup for an independent research project on diffusion in two dimensions. Students placed a drop of dye on a horizontal sheet of paper towel and recorded the the spot size as a function of time using a video camera, stopwatch, and two rulers.

that the deviation of the wire's shape from a perfect triangle could be neglected at the level of precision of their measurements.

During their final discussion of the experiment, the students reflected on the iterative process of using data and uncertainty to inform improvements on their model and experimental procedure. A key discussion topic was the role of iterative improvement as general feature of the scientific research process.

B. Independent research projects

In the last half of the course, students applied what they learned about the nature of research to independent research projects where they iteratively settled upon a research question in tandem with designing and conducting an experiment to answer it. During class number eight (Fig. 1), the students took fifteen minutes to group themselves based on interest in pursuing one particular topic chosen from a list of suggestions provided by the instructors. Under the guidance of a volunteer graduate student serving as a research advisor, each group of three to four students began working together to formulate a research question that they could answer within the limited resources and seven week time-frame given to them.

Each group designed an experiment which was iteratively improved through multiple initial trials. In many cases, early results forced students to revise their initial research question. The final experimental setup used by one of the groups, whose research goal was to compare diffusion rates in one and two dimensions, is shown in Fig. 3. The experiments conducted by the other groups were measurements of the thickness of thin films using interference patterns, measurements of the rotation rate of the Earth by tracking the position of shadows over the course of a day, and measurements of the speed of light using a microwave and marshmallows. As the project deadline approached, students worked to analyze the data they had collected and compile their conclusions into a detailed report. The students communicated their findings to the broader Compass community via a poster session at the end-of-year Compass celebration.

C. Holistic student support

Outside the classroom, Compass supported holistic student growth through mentoring, group tutoring, and professional development workshops. This was reinforced through the use of cooperative learning and weekly reflections (Fig. 1) within the course. We now elaborate on the use of reflections.

Students were guided to write weekly reflections about their progress in a science or math class taken concurrently with *Intro to Measurement*. Each week, the instructors responded to students' reflections with individualized feedback in a mentoring-style relationship. These homework assignments helped the students focus on ten key lifelong learning skills (adapted from J. Bender [28, 29]), including: persistence, self-compassion, courage, and connections (*e.g.*, Table II). The rubric (see Appendix A) described each of the ten skills as well as what it means to be beginning, developing, or succeeding at the practice of each skill. The rubric further included prompt questions which students could use to help structure their reflections.

Both scientific abilities and lifelong learning skills are important for preparing students to succeed in authentic research settings [30]. Other work has explored the use of rubrics in emphasizing scientific abilities, such as the ability to design and conduct various types of experiments [31]. The Compass rubrics are designed to facilitate self-reflection explicitly on lifelong learning skills such as persistence and organization. They are not used to assess students or assign grades, but meant to guide a "penpal" style of dialogue where students reflect on their progress and instructors respond with instructive as well as affective support.

The weekly reflections also provided a foundation for class discussions that prompted students to compare various measures of their growth as learners, including grades. A distinguishing feature of the course is that, during these discussions, the students were asked to use the same techniques developed for understanding measurements of scientific quantities to think about measurements of student learning. Discussion topics included:

- What model is used to relate grades and learning? Are the corresponding assumptions valid?
- How big is the uncertainty in my course grade? Where does it come from and what does it mean?

TABLE II. An excerpt from a rubric to guide student self-reflection on lifelong learning skills.

Learning Skill	Questions to ask yourself	Beginning	Developing	Succeeding
Persistence	What do you do when you're frustrated? Do you independently pursue understanding?	I tend to try one or two things. I give up more easily than I should.	I try to stick with things, but I sometimes feel unsuccessful. Sometimes I seek new approaches.	I look for new ways to think about the problem. I find a way to persist when appropriate.

- How can we improve the way we monitor our growth, and how do we use this information to improve our learning?

By thinking through and discussing these kinds of questions, students developed their skills of using personal feedback in positive ways.

III. RESEARCH METHOD AND RESULTS

Intro to Measurement was first offered in spring 2012 and the present work focuses on the second iteration of the course. We draw on the following sources of data: artifacts from the thermal expansion experiment, Physics Measurement Questionnaire (PMQ) surveys [32, 33] and interviews, and students' weekly reflections. These data provided insight into students' iterative refinement of research experiments, their understanding of measurement and uncertainty, and their development of science learning skills. Eight of ten students in the course agreed to participate in the study, completing the PMQ and submitting their reflections for analysis.

A. Method

We administered the PMQ survey near the beginning and at the end of the course to document changes in students' reasoning about measurement uncertainty. The PMQ focuses on four categories: interpreting a single reading, processing repeated readings, comparing two data sets, and understanding the nature of uncertainty. The pre- and post-instruction surveys use a ball-and-ramp system and a mass-and-spring system, respectively, to provide context for the survey questions. While the PMQ consists of multiple choice questions and student explanations of their responses, only student written responses are coded. Student responses were coded by two separate pairs of researchers. Each pair coded all responses as a team, and afterwards the teams compared their coding in order to establish inter-rater reliability.

To verify our coding process, we also conducted semi-structured pre/post-interviews for four students. The interviews asked students to clarify any ambiguous responses to their surveys. The interview data were coded using the PMQ coding scheme, and the results were compared to the survey analyses. Interviews were coded as a team who discussed the coding until consensus was reached.

Student responses to the PMQ were categorized as characteristic of either the point or set paradigm [34]. The *point paradigm* is characterized by the belief that a single measurement could in principle be the true value, and the *set paradigm* by the belief that a single measurement is an approximation to the true value and that deviations from the true value are random. Whereas the point paradigm may lead to the belief that only a single measurement is necessary to determine a quantity's true value, the set paradigm leads to the belief that many measurements are needed and that data need to be analyzed collectively. Student perspectives on measurement also relate to their understanding of the nature of science, with students who adopt a set-like perspective more likely to accurately view the development of scientific theories [35].

Student reflections and instructor feedback were analyzed to better understand the lifelong learning skills that students focused on most often. The majority of students explicitly stated which skills they were focused on, but when they did not, we inferred the learning skills from the text of their reflections. We also analyzed instructor responses, in order to categorize the types of feedback and support that instructors provided to students. Instructor responses were coded for both affective and instructive components.

B. Iterative refinement of models

Over the course of the thermal expansion experiment, students learned how to calculate and report uncertainties in measurements. Perhaps more importantly, they practiced *using* the uncertainties that they calculated in refining their models and experimental procedures. They grappled with the question, "What is negligible?" as they ran into systematic errors in their initial results, such as an apparent temperature dependence in the measurement of the thermal expansion coefficient. This systematic error, which comes about largely because their model did not include stretching of the wire, was significant as compared to the uncertainty in their measurements and this prompted them to question the validity of their model.

The second iteration of the thermal expansion experiment focused entirely on testing the assumptions of the initial model to find out what effects were (or could be made) negligible at the precision of the apparatus, and what effects must be accounted for in the model. The

class came up with a list of possible assumptions and experimental procedures to probe them, such as whether the wire is actually pulled into a triangle shape (as opposed to being catenary-like), how does the choice of the weight of the hanging weight effect the results, what are the best procedures to increase precision of the apparatus, and how does repeated heating and cooling affect the wire.

The students broke off into groups so that they could tackle these questions in parallel. One group found ways to reduce measurement uncertainty, such as using a mirror to reduce parallax error when measuring the change in height of the hanging weight. Another group explored whether repeated heating and cooling of the wire resulted in permanent changes in its length; they found that their measurement uncertainty was too large to characterize this effect. The group that investigated the effect of the mass of the hanging weight characterized the stiffness of the wire and used the deviations of their measurements from the predictions of the triangle model to determine when the mass of the wire itself became important. This informed the choice of mass for the hanging weight in the final iteration of the experiment.

Responses on the PMQ suggest that student discussions of the iterative nature of experimentation and modeling increased in sophistication over the course of the semester. Consider the following pre-instruction survey responses:

> "The reflexes of humans vary. Not until they modify their model will they be able to get a more precise answer."
>
> "Experimental value vs. actual value [of a quantity] usually aren't that far off. If this wasn't true, how would many of the constants used in physics and chemistry work today? An app[roximation] can be concluded, as long as one takes into consideration all limiting factors and seeks to improve them."

While these students recognize that models and experiments need to be improved, they make underdeveloped connections between model, measurement, and iteration. After instruction, two different students painted a richer picture of the iterative process:

> "[W]e don't really need to know the exact real value of [a quantity] in real life. In fact, in reality, a good approximation of measurements is good enough for us to convince people that our model is a pretty good approximation in real life and can be used as a reference."
>
> "We can never know the real value of [a quantity]. Because our measurements will always vary between tests, we can never measure anything with infinite precision, and every test is slightly different. However, ... we can do more tests to increase our certainty or design a new experiment to increase our precision enough such that we can know [the quantity] to any degree of certainty necessary for practical purposes."

TABLE III. Number of students (out of 8) using point, set, or mixed reasoning, as assessed with the PMQ.

		Post-instruction			
		Mostly Point	Mixed	Mostly Set	Total
Pre-instruction	Mostly Point	0	0	0	0
	Mixed	0	1	3	4
	Mostly Set	0	0	4	4
	Total	0	1	7	8

In these responses, one student talked about model and measurement as interconnected ideas and the other described in detail how measurements can be improved. Because none of the PMQ questions specifically prompted students to discuss iterative improvement, the above responses were part of students' reasoning about items directly probed by the PMQ. No students wrote about iteration in both their pre- and post-instruction surveys. Therefore, we cannot at present determine whether or how Intro to Measurement course increased the sophistication of students' understanding of the role of uncertainty in the iterative process of conducting and refining experiments. Nevertheless, these results provide strong motivation for probing this aspect of student understanding in future studies.

C. Understanding of measurement and uncertainty

We analyzed nine questions related to measurement uncertainty that appeared on both the pre- and post-instruction PMQs [32]. We coded a total of 144 responses. The two pairs of researchers who independently coded students' PMQ responses agreed on 102 items (71% agreement). By computing Cohen's unweighted kappa statistic ($\kappa = 0.38$) [36], we conclude that there was fair inter-rater agreement [37]. All four coders discussed discrepancies as a group and reached full consensus on each case after discussion.

Given the fair level of agreement, we validated our coding procedure for survey responses by coding student interview responses, which were more elaborate than their survey responses. About half of the interview questions focused on survey items whose codes were initially inconsistent (but later reconciled via consensus). The remaining interview questions revisited survey items on which both pairs of researchers initially agreed. Coding of student interviews was consistent with the consensus scores assigned to the surveys in all cases.

Survey responses were generally corroborated by interview data. For instance, when responding to a post-instruction PMQ question about processing repeated

readings, "Taylor" wrote "With more trials there can be values of d that are not of these values, due to how far they compress the spring with the mass." Here d is the distance a block travels along a rough table after being pushed by a compressed spring, and "these values" refers to previously recorded measurements of d. When asked to elaborate during an interview, Taylor said:

> "Actually how far they compress the spring and the mass is actually not the only factor. There are many others. For example, the k in the spring. ... With more compression in the spring, it might actually change a little bit, over time a little bit. That's something that's neglected in our standard model forces, but still, even that can cause some uncertainty. ... The way they measure d is still, again, another factor on what value they're going to get. Those are three big factors and there are probably more."

Here k refers to the spring constant of the compressed spring. In both responses, Taylor identified mechanisms by which repeated measurements of d may fluctuate; the only difference between survey and interview responses was in the number of mechanisms identified. Other student interviews were similarly consistent with written responses.

The three mechanisms for data fluctuation identified by Taylor include: inconsistent replication in initial conditions due to "how far they compress the spring," deviations from Hooke's Law due to a changing spring constant, and the details of the measurement procedure. In both the pre- and post-instruction surveys, students discussed human-, equipment-, and model-based sources of uncertainty in their short answer responses. Prior to instruction, students identified "human reflexes," "systematic offsets," and "varying gravitational fields" as potential sources of uncertainty. Post-instruction, students painted a richer picture of sources of uncertainty, including the care with which the procedure is carried out, the human subconscious, errors in equipment, finite precision of measurement tools, and systematic effects like friction. These responses are characteristic of the types of challenges students faced when refining the thermal expansion experiment and designing their independent research investigations.

As Table III shows, no students were classified as using mostly point reasoning either before or after instruction. After instruction, three of the four mixed reasoners shifted to using set reasoning all or most of the time. In each of these three cases, the shift between categories was due to changes on two or more PMQ questions. We further analyzed the number of students using set reasoning in each of the four categories of the PMQ (Table IV). Students who used set-like reasoning on all of the survey items within a particular category were labeled "consistent set" reasoners. Because no students in the present study used mostly point-like reasoning prior to instruction, the shifts measured in three of the four PMQ categories are limited by ceiling effects. The largest observed shift was in students' reasoning when comparing two data sets.

TABLE IV. Number of students (out of 8) using consistent set reasoning broken down by category.

Category	Pre	Post
Interpreting a single measurement	5	6
Processing repeated measurements	7	6
Comparing data sets	1	6
Nature of uncertainty	5	7
All questions	1	3

Due to the small size of the cohort in the present work, it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the relative impact of our intervention on students' reasoning about scientific measurement and uncertainty. We can, however, provide context for these results by considering previous studies of point and set paradigms in student reasoning. Specifically, we consider studies in which the PMQ was used to measure shifts in reasoning in both traditional [33] and reformed [32] introductory physics lab courses at the University of Cape Town and in which a survey based on the PMQ was used to evaluate a reformed lab course at the University of Maryland [38]. Each of the studies involved 50-120 students, a much larger population than is considered in the present work. Consistent with the reform courses at Maryland [38] and Cape Town [32], our students had relatively large shifts towards set-like reasoning in comparing data sets (see Table IV). In contrast, students in the traditional lab courses at Cape Town [33] did not show such gains.

D. Lifelong learning skills

We analyzed 73 student reflections and the related instructor feedback from the weekly written reflections over the course of the semester. In 54 of 73 reflections, students explicitly stated the skills they were focused on (e.g., saying "this week I will focus on self-compassion"). In 12 of the remaining 19 reflections, students used language directly from the rubrics without explicitly stating the skill (e.g., writing about "frustration" reflects language in the persistence skill prompt). The remaining 7 reflections did not follow the prompt for any particular skill. Students were not limited to one skill per reflection; in fact, 30% of the reflections contained two or more learning skills.

The most popular skills for reflection were organization (35%), connections (18%), persistence (15%), self-compassion (9%), and courage (8%). The other skills were only reflected on a few times each. Thus, more than half of the reflections focused on just three skills, namely, organization, connections, and persistence.

Reflections related to organization focused primarily

on time management (86%). Most of these reflections referred to time management specifically; others used phrases like, "I want to be efficient with the little time I've got," or "I did not have the time to keep up with my work." Most students were not used to the work load of college, and struggled to keep up. Students made statements such as:

> "Due to the volume of work to be done (and the limited length of time), I sometimes find myself going through the motions..."

and,

> "I stayed up all night and managed to get 2 and a half hours of sleep last night."

Reflections about connections focused on creating collaborations with other students, such as a study group (63%), or in using the office hours of their GSI or instructor (37%)[1]. We note that the rubric treats building connections as a distinct skill from collaboration which includes, among other things, working productively with others (Appendix A). In contrast, reflections about persistence did not have any clear themes. Students reflected on many different areas, such as: staying focused and not giving up on long homework assignments, personal difficulties staying focused on school, and continuing towards a college degree despite feeling unsuccessful.

Instructor responses to student reflections focused on a variety of themes. To support students holistically, instructor responses typically included both an affective and instructive component. The affective responses focused on supporting students through personal struggles they faced; here are examples of the types of affective responses instructors gave:

- Affirmation: "I, personally, am glad you are a part of Compass and physics so that I've had a chance to get to know you."
- Empathizing: "Figuring out that it is okay and even beneficial to drop a class is something that is hard to deal with. I know this is something I struggled with as a student."
- Normalizing: "Impostor Syndrome... basically means that you think you are the only one struggling and eventually everyone else will figure out that you don't understand things as well. Everyone (including myself) thinks this from time to time."

On the instructive side of feedback, the instructors suggested resources or strategies that students could use to improve their physics learning. They also suggested resources that could help students be more successful in their college transition.

- Suggesting Strategies: "[M]ake sure you get the most out of every problem you do. What I mean is to take a few moments after you read a problem and think generally about what concepts or techniques might be useful before you start working. After you finish the problem, reflect on what you did."
- Pointing to Resources: "Prof. [Smith] teaches a class that uses ROOT for some of the homeworks. His website is here:"
- Non-academic Support: "Have you looked at padmapper.com for apartments? It is useful for off campus housing and it is how I found my apartment."

Most instructor responses included some aspect of affective support (82%) and concrete instructions for working on a challenge (85%). The quality of student and instructor interactions suggested collegial, supportive, and non-traditional student-instructor relationships, which may be connected to students' persistence in the sciences [15, 20] and warrants future study.

IV. SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The Compass Project's *Intro to Measurement* course provides an example of a physics laboratory course that emphasizes the iterative nature of research practice through authentic inquiry projects. By using uncertainty analysis to inform improvements on their experimental designs and theoretical models, students developed greater understanding of the nature of measurement. This course further supported students in development of lifelong learning skills through guided self-reflection and personalized instructor feedback. The reflection and feedback process provided students with affective support, a unique feature of the course.

Student responses to the PMQ showed that nearly all 8 of the students in the study achieved set-like reasoning by the end of the course. However, gains in student understanding of the nature of measurement were limited by the ceiling effect. On the pre-instruction survey, half of students were already using set-like reasoning most of the time, and none of the students used point-like reasoning most of the time. Most of the students had already completed a Compass class or attended the Compass summer program, which also emphasize authentic science experiences and metacognitive skills. This suggests that we should administer future questionnaires to Compass students before the summer program to better assess gains from Compass interventions. Further research is required to develop a large enough data set to confirm any trends about gains seen in set like reasoning .

Student reflections and instructor responses supported meaningful exchanges about topics ranging from coping with the workload of college to dealing with impostor

[1] Because students could reflect on multiple topics each week, these two topics only cover most, not all, of the student reflections.

syndrome. An analysis of students' reflections showed that students focused primarily on three areas: organization, connections, and persistence. Moreover, analysis of responses within these categories showed that the majority of students focused on the same issues, such as time management and networking with others. Meanwhile, instructor responses included both affective and instructive components, simultaneously empathizing with students' challenges and pointing them towards strategies and resources to help them overcome those challenges. We believe that targeted support for students to focus lifelong learning skills could be a promising direction for future research.

Given the importance of authentic introductory lab coursework [4] and supportive student-instructor relationships [20] to students' persistence in the sciences, *Intro to Measurement* plays an important role in ongoing efforts by Compass to promote retention in the sciences at UC Berkeley, particularly among students from underrepresented groups. Moreover, due to the introductory nature of the physics concepts covered in the course, elements of *Intro to Measurement* may be adapted for use in high school settings. The thermal expansion experiment, for instance, is an ideal activity for engaging high school students in developing and using models, analyzing and interpreting data, and other scientific and engineering practices outlined in the *Next Generation Science Standards* [39].

Finally, the case of the *Intro to Measurement* course represents an intersection of educational transformation and student empowerment. In contrast to both traditional, faculty-led transformation efforts (cf., Ref. [40]) as well as cogenerative reform processes where teachers and their students work together to identify pedagogical improvements (cf., Refs. [41, 42]), *Intro to Measurement* was designed, implemented, and refined exclusively by graduate and undergraduate students [8]. Such authentic engagement of students as leaders is considered a fundamental aspect of promoting student voice [43]. Moreover, research on institutional transformation highlights that change efforts which do not afford the actors involved in the change efforts such agency are much less likely to be effective [44]. While the general Compass approach to educational and organizational reform is outlined elsewhere [8], future studies are needed to fully understand the impact of student-led course transformation efforts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge Andy diSessa and Saalih Allie for their mentorship and guidance throughout the project, Andy Buffler and the University of Cape Town Physics Education Research Group for sharing their PMQ coding schemes, and Ben Spike, Ben Zwickl, Gina Quan, Hilary Jacks, Joel Corbo, and Rebbekah Semel for fruitful discussions and invaluable feedback. This work was supported by the Berkeley Compass Project, which in turn receives support from the University of California, Berkeley as well as from private donations.

[1] National Research Council, *Discipline-Based Education Research: Understanding and Improving Learning in Undergraduate Science and Engineering*, edited by Susan R. Singer, Natalie R. Nielsen, and Heidi A. Schweingruber (National Academies Press, 2012).

[2] David W. Piston, "Research tools: Understand how it works," Nature **484**, 440–441 (2012).

[3] American Association of Physics Teachers, "Goals of the introductory physics laboratory," American Journal of Physics **66**, 483–485 (1998).

[4] President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, *Engage to Excel: Producing One Million Addition College Graduates with Degrees in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*, Tech. Rep. (Executive Office of the President, 2012).

[5] *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*, Tech. Rep. (Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, 1998).

[6] *The U.S. STEM undergraduate model: Applying system dynamics to help meet President Obamas goals for one million STEM graduates and the U.S. Navys civilian STEM workforce*, Tech. Rep. (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2013).

[7] Committee on Undergraduate Physics Education Research, Implementation; Board on Physics, Astronomy; Division on Engineering, and Physical Sciences; National Research Council, *Adapting to a Changing World–Challenges and Opportunities in Undergraduate Physics Education* (The National Academies Press, 2013).

[8] Badr F. Albanna, Joel C. Corbo, Dimitri R. Dounas-Frazer, Angela Little, and Anna M. Zaniewski, "Building classroom and organizational structure around positive cultural values," AIP Conference Proceedings **1513**, 7–10 (2013).

[9] Benjamin M. Zwickl, Noah Finkelstein, and H. J. Lewandowski, "The process of transforming an advanced lab course: Goals, curriculum, and assessments," American Journal of Physics **81**, 63–70 (2013).

[10] Mark F. Masters and Timothy T. Grove, "Active learning in intermediate optics through concept building laboratories," American Journal of Physics **78**, 485–491 (2010).

[11] Eric Brewe, "Modeling theory applied: Modeling instruction in introductory physics," American Journal of Physics **76**, 1155–1160 (2008).

[12] E. Etkina and A. Van Heuvelen, "Investigative science learning environment: A science-process approach to learning physics." in *Research-based reform of university*

physics, Vol. 1, edited by E. F. Redish and P. J. Cooney (American Association of Physics Teachers, 2007).

[13] McDermott, L.C., and the Physics Education Group at the University of Washington, *Physics by inquiry: An introduction to physics and the physical sciences*, Vol. 1 (John Wiley & Sons, 1996).

[14] McDermott, L.C., and the Physics Education Group at the University of Washington, *Physics by inquiry: An introduction to physics and the physical sciences*, Vol. 2 (John Wiley & Sons, 1996).

[15] National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering and Institute of Medicine Committee on Underrepresented Groups and the Expansion of the Science and Engineering Workforce Pipeline, *Expanding Underrepresented Minority Participation* (National Academies Press, 2011) Chap. 6, Academic and Social Support.

[16] D. R. Dounas-Frazer, J. Lynn, A. M. Zaniewski, and N. Roth, "Learning about non-newtonian fluids in a student-driven classroom," The Physics Teacher **51**, 32–34 (2013).

[17] Geoffrey L. Cohen, Claude M. Steele, and Lee D. Ross, "The mentor dilemma: Providing critical feedback across the racial divide," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin **25**, 1302–1318 (1999).

[18] Aneeta Rattan, Catherine Good, and Carol S. Dweck, "t's ok not everyone can be good at math Instructors with an entity theory comfort (and demotivate) students," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology **48**, 731 – 737 (2012).

[19] Carol S. Dweck, *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success* (Random House, 2006).

[20] Elaine Seymour and Nancy M. Hewitt, *Talking about leaving: Why undergraduates leave the sciences* (Westview Press, 1997).

[21] Elizabeth G. Cohen and Rachel A. Lotan, eds., *Working for Equity in Heterogeneous Classrooms: Sociological Theory in Practice* (Teachers College Press, 1997).

[22] D. M. Desbien, *Modeling discourse management compared to other classroom management styles in university physics*, Ph.D. thesis, Arizona State University (2002).

[23] Seymour Papert and Idit Hardel, *Constructionism* (Ablex Publishing, 1991).

[24] F. T. Lyman, "The responsive classroom discussion: The inclusion of all students," in *Mainstreaming Digest*, edited by A. S. Anderson (The University of Maryland Press, College Park, MD, 1981) pp. 109–113.

[25] John Hattie and Helen Timperley, "The power of feedback," Review of Educational Research **77**, 81–112 (2007).

[26] Barry J. Zimmerman, "Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview," Theory Into Practice **41**, 64–70 (2002).

[27] Dimitri R. Dounas-Frazer, Punit R. Gandhi, and Geoffrey Z. Iwata, "Uncertainty analysis for a simple thermal expansion experiment," American Journal of Physics **81**, 338–342 (2013).

[28] Jon Bender, "Measuring Growth, Part 1: Origin of the Self-Evaluation Rubrics," `http://www.berkeleycompassproject.org/measuring-growth-part-1-origin-of-the-self-evaluation-rubrics/` (2012).

[29] Dimitri Dounas-Frazer, "Measuring Growth, Part 2: Self-Evaluation in Compass," `http://www.berkeleycompassproject.org/measuring-growth-part-2-self-evaluation-in-compass/` (2012).

[30] Sandra Laursen, Anne-Barrie Hunter, Elaine Seymour, Heather Thiry, and Ginger Melton, *Undergraduate research in the sciences: Engaging students in real science* (Jossey-Bass, 2010).

[31] Eugenia Etkina, Alan Van Heuvelen, Suzanne White-Brahmia, David T. Brookes, Michael Gentile, Sahana Murthy, David Rosengrant, and Aaron Warren, "Scientific abilities and their assessment," Phys. Rev. ST Phys. Educ. Res. **2**, 020103 (2006).

[32] Seshini Pillay, Andy Buffler, Fred Lubben, and Saalih Allie, "Effectiveness of a gum-compliant course for teaching measurement in the introductory physics laboratory," European Journal of Physics **29**, 647–659 (2008).

[33] Trevor S. Volkwyn, Saalih Allie, Andy Buffler, and Fred Lubben, "Impact of a conventional introductory laboratory course on the understanding of measurement," Phys. Rev. ST Phys. Educ. Res. **4**, 010108 (2008).

[34] Fred Lubben, Bob Campbell, Andy Buffler, and Saalih Allie, "Point and set reasoning in practical science measurement by entering university freshmen," Science Education **85**, 311–327 (2001).

[35] Andy Buffler, Fred Lubben, and Bashirah Ibrahim, "The relationship between students views of the nature of science and their views of the nature of scientific measurement," International Journal of Science Education **31**, 1137–1156 (2009).

[36] Jacob Cohen, "A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales." Educational and Psychological Measurement **20**, 37–46 (1960).

[37] Nicole J.-M. Blackman and John J. Koval, "Interval estimation for Cohen's kappa as a measure of agreement," Statistics in Medicine **19**, 723–741 (2000).

[38] Rebecca Lippmann Kung, "Teaching the concepts of measurement: An example of a concept-based laboratory course," American Journal of Physics **73**, 771–777 (2005).

[39] NGSS Lead States, "Next Generation Science Standards: For States, By States," (2013).

[40] Stephanie V. Chasteen, Katherine K. Perkins, Paul D. Beale, Steven J. Pollock, and Carl E. Wieman, "A Thoughtful Approach to Instruction: Course Transformation for the Rest of Us," Journal of College Science Teaching **40**, 24–30 (2011).

[41] Natan Samuels, Eric Brewe, and Laird Kramer, "Cogenerative physics reform through cmple," in *Physics Education Research Conference 2013*, PER Conference (Portland, OR, 2013) pp. 317–320.

[42] Kenneth Tobin, "Learning to teach through coteaching and cogenerative dialogue," Teaching Education **17**, 133–142 (2006).

[43] Michael Fielding, "Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities," British Educational Research Journal **30**, 295–311 (2004).

[44] Charles Henderson, Andrea Beach, and Noah Finkelstein, "Facilitating change in undergraduate STEM instructional practices: an analytic review of the literature," Journal of Research in Science Teaching **48**, 952–984 (2011).

Physics 98: Introduction to Measurment, Spring 2013

Self-Evaluation Rubric

The self-evaluation rubrics are designed to help you in your process of self-reflection. Each skill in the rubric has questions to help you understand what the skill means and descriptions of what it means to be beginning, developing, and succeeding in each skill. The skills are divided into a primary set, which you should focus on first, and an advanced set, which you should move on to once you feel like you are succeeding in the primary set.

Once you pick the class in which you want to self-evaluate, use the rubrics to identify skills that you want to work on each week and write about your progress in those skills in your self-evaluations. Honest, thoughtful reflection is key here: there is no way to improve if you are not truthful with yourself about how you are doing.

Your self-evaluations are due by **midnight each Monday** in your **dropbox on bSpace** as **PDFs**, and should contain the following pieces of information:

- The name of the class you are evaluating.
- The skill(s) you are evaluating
- Whether you think you are beginning, developing, or succeeding in each skill. This should be accompanied by evidence to support your decision (for example, an anecdote).
- In what way you want to improve in each skill, and how you will do that. This will require you to **identify** the change you want to make, come up with a plan to **implement** that change, be **consistent** in your implementation, and **frequently reassess** how your change is working.

Primary Skills

Skill	Questions to ask yourself	Beginning	Developing	Succeeding
Persistence	• What do you do when you're frustrated? • Do you independently pursue understanding?	I tend to try one or two things. I give up more easily than I should.	I try to stick with things, but I sometimes feel unsuccessful. Sometimes I seek new approaches to help.	I look for new ways to think about the problem. I find a way to persist when appropriate.
Organization	• Do you keep accurate, thorough, and consistent records of work? • Do you submit materials in a timely manner? • Do you refer to your records to support conclusions?	There are significant gaps in my records, and/or I consistently forget to complete assignments on time.	I don't complete all assignments on time or I have no record of some of my work/activities. When I neglect to do something, I forget about it because it's too late.	I am timely and thorough with work and record-keeping. When I've neglected something, I correct my oversight quickly. My records are a valuable resource.
Connections	• Do you try to make connections with new people who might be able to help you in the future? • Do you make use of your connections when you need help?	I tend to go it alone.	I sometimes get help from other people, but only when I really need it. My network of supporters could be better developed.	I have a strong network of people who I go to regularly for help and support.
Self-compassion	• When you're having difficulty with something, how do you feel about yourself? • Do you make productive use of failure?	I have trouble with feeling like a failure, and these feelings often make me feel like giving up. I'm my own worst critic.	I am sometimes overly critical of myself. I tend to ignore feelings of failure rather than using them to improve.	I acknowledge my difficulty, but I don't let it define how I feel about myself. I act kindly towards myself and view failure as an opportunity for self-improvement.

Advanced Skills

Skill	Questions to ask yourself	Beginning	Developing	Succeeding
Courage	• How do you react to uncertainty? • What do you do when you feel overwhelmed? • Do you take intellectual risks?	I don't like to try things unless I'm reasonably certain what the outcome will be.	I take some risks, but I sometimes miss out on some good opportunities.	I make a decision to trust that I'll learn something from each experience, even if I'm unsure at times.
Mental Resourcefulness	• Where do you turn for new ideas? • Do you look for connections between ideas? • Do you apply past experiences to new situations?	When something feels unfamiliar, I often assume it's not useful.	There have been times when I disregarded new ideas before considering them fully. I don't often see connections between what I'm doing and what I've done.	I always try to consider things, even if they seem odd or surprising at first. I often relate new ideas to old ones.
Communication	• Can you clearly convey an idea to someone else using pictures, speech, or demonstrations? • Do you give examples that support your ideas? • Do you seek consistency in ideas?	It seems like others don't understand what I'm trying to say/convey most of the time. Once I try to communicate something, I move on to the next thing.	I can usually convey my ideas, but often others don't seem to understand what I'm trying to communicate. When the message doesn't get across, I might try one other way of communicating.	Communication is strength of mine. When I'm feeling misunderstood, I search for new ways to convey my point. I look back through my conclusions to make sure they're clear and consistent.
Diligent Skepticism	• How do you evaluate the quality of procedures? • Do you scrutinize sources of information and search for ways to test ideas? • Can you identify problems with procedure that lead to erroneous or incomplete conclusions?	Much of what I believe came from someone else directly. When someone sounds convincing, I trust that they are right.	I should ask more questions about information that I receive, and steps that I'm taking. Sometimes I discover that I've been lead down a path that I could have avoided with more thought, testing, and questioning.	I ask plenty of questions (to myself and others) and head off problems before they start.
Collaboration	• Are you respectful, supportive, and critical of peers? • Do you share your ideas with others? • Do you consider strategies employed by your peers for study, organization, and investigation?	Sometimes I either: don't participate; dominate the work, so that others might not feel like they have a role; or, distract others.	I'm great as either a leader or participant, but not both. I could be more mindful of the needs of others with whom I work. I try to learn from what others are doing.	I am an asset to any team. I know how to lead when appropriate, and how to support others when they take the lead. I think pretty much everyone has something to offer me.
Reflection	• Do you consider past experiences when making choices? • Do you reference prior work? • Are your reflections thoughtful and substantive?	Once I complete something, I usually just move on to the next thing, without thinking about how it went.	I don't always reflect after each science experience. I don't review my notes during and after a topic of study. I'm not great about considering how things went.	I squeeze every bit of learning from everything that I do by evaluating what happened. My notes are excellent, and I use them often to check on my ideas.

This rubric is adapted from work by Jon Bender and is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/)